



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,689	07/30/2001	Trevor D. Hitchin	10004198-1	2188

7590 02/03/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

RAHIMI, IRAJ A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/918,689	Applicant(s) HITCHIN, TREVOR D.	
	Examiner (Iraj) Alan Rahimi	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 6, 10, 11 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg et al. (US patent 6,362,897) in view of Martin et al. (US patent application 2002/0046195).

Regarding claim 1, Berg discloses in a unitary business machine with a top, bottom, front, back and two sides, a customized form output apparatus, the apparatus comprising:

- a) electronic data storage for storing pre-selected customized forms (hard drive 16);
- b) a display 12 connected to the data storage for displaying stored forms;
- c) a selector (touch screen monitor 12) connected to the data storage for selecting form the display.

Although Berg discloses a printer 30 for printing the form in the printing system, he does not explicitly disclose an integral printer. Martin discloses an integral hard copy printer 210 connected to the data storage for printing a hard copy of said forms as selected. Martin discloses printing various amounts of stamps on paper or labels. The stamps are represented by indicia on paper. Examiner considers selection of any of these indicia to be same as selecting a form.

Berg and Martin are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is printing pre-selected materials.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the printer integral to the system.

The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to make a self-contained printing system and facilitate ease of operation and handling.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Berg with Martin to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 3, Berg discloses the apparatus of claim 1 wherein said data storage is a hard drive 16 conformed to receive electronic input for new customized forms and to store input forms.

Regarding claim 4, Martin discloses the apparatus of claim 1 wherein said display is a flat panel display (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 5, Martin discloses the apparatus of claim 1 wherein said selector is a touch screen overlaying said display.

Regarding claim 7, Berg discloses the apparatus of claim 1 wherein said selector further comprises user selections from a group including select, print, and cancel (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 10, argument analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable. The power source connection to the box is inherent in Berg and Martin as their systems/devices would not work without source of power.

Regarding claim 11, Martin does not disclose the kiosk of claim 10 wherein the box is conformed in size to approximately match the length and width of a sheet of letter sized or legal sized paper. Martin discloses his invention in a shape as shown in 7 (Kiosk 712). Examiner considers the size of the kiosk to be a matter of design choice. Size of the box can be adapted to fit a particular need based on customer interaction, space availability, cost, etc. Therefore it would have obvious to make the box approximately the size of a letter or legal paper to keep it small enough to fit in small places.

Regarding claim 14, Martin discloses the kiosk of claim 10 wherein said box is conformed to hold fifty to one hundred sheets of paper for printing. It is obvious in Martin that the Kiosk would hold over 100 sheets of self-adhesive paper for printing stamp indicia on them, because such Kiosk would be expected to dispense several hundred stamp indicia before loading more paper. Martin also discloses in paragraph 45 that his system could be used for other than printing stamps such as buying tickets and paying bills.

Regarding claim 15, argument analogous to those presented for claim 5, are applicable.

Regarding claim 16, argument analogous to those presented for claim 3, are applicable.

Regarding claim 17, argument analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

Regarding claim 18, argument analogous to those presented for claim 11, are applicable.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg et al. (US patent 6,362,897) in view of Martin et al. (US patent application 2002/0046195) and further in view of Evanicky et al. (US patent 6,657,607).

Regarding claim 2, Berg and Martin do not disclose the apparatus of claim 1 further comprising a wall mount connected to the back for mounting the apparatus on a wall.

Evanicky et al. discloses a mounting bracket in Fig. 1.D and column 9, lines 1-4 for mounting the desktop display to the wall.

Berg, Martin and Evanicky et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is displaying objects.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a wall mount bracket to the Berg printing system.

The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to install his printing system off the table and on the wall to avoid the need for a table top for placing his printing system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Berg, Martin and Evanicky et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Art Unit: 2622

4. Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg et al. (US patent 6,362,897) in view of Martin et al. (US patent application 2002/0046195) and further in view of Mansutti.

Regarding claim 6, Berg and Martin do not disclose the apparatus of claim 1 further comprising a battery for providing power for operation. Mansutti discloses battery pack 25 to operate the portable computer having a memory, display, printer, etc.

Berg, Martin and are Mansutti are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is displaying objects.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have battery operate the Berg printing system.

The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to have backup source of power in case of power outage.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Berg, Martin and Mansutti to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Regarding claim 15, argument analogous to those presented for claim 6, are applicable.

5. Claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg et al. (US patent 6,362,897) in view of Martin et al. (US patent application 2002/0046195) and further in view of Smith (US patent 5,995,942).

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 8, Berg and Martin do not disclose the apparatus of claim 1 further comprising a paper holder connected to said integral printer and to the back of the apparatus. Smith discloses a paper holder in Fig. 2 and column 4, lines 35-42.

Berg, Martin and are Smith are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is printing objects.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to put the paper holder in the back of a printer apparatus.

The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to ease loading of paper.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Berg, Martin and Smith to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Regarding claim 9, Smith discloses the apparatus of claim 1 wherein said hard copy of a selected form is dispensed from the bottom of the apparatus and paper for printing is input at the top of the apparatus (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 12 and 19, argument analogous to those presented for claim 8, are applicable.

Regarding claim 13 and 20, argument analogous to those presented for claim 9, are applicable.

Other prior art cited

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2622

Simon et al. (US patent 6,158,906) discloses a device to print on back of photographs.

Miyamoto (US patent application 2003/0197894) discloses an apparatus for layout and editing for different images.

Parker (US patent 6,429,892) discloses automated self-portrait vending system.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Iraj) Alan Rahimi whose telephone number is 703-306-3473.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on 703-305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Alan Rahimi
January 25, 2005



JOSEPH R. PORCZYWA
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2622